



**ANIMAL PROTECTION & CONTROL
ADVISORY BOARD
Meeting Minutes
May 27th, 2004**

In Attendance:

Dr. Elizabeth Grauer
Pat Jollota
Shirley Malar

Staff:

Linda Moorhead
Teri Wilson

Phil Olson

I. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Shirley Malar at 6:33 p.m. Staff advised that Carol Williams and Greg Ellison contacted the office to say they would not attend. Shirley Malar will act as chair person.

II. Reading & Approval of the April 2004 minutes:

The minutes were examined and approved as written.

III. Orders of the Day

Statistical Report

Phil Olson discussed the statistics for the SW Washington Humane Society for the prior month. He explained that although adoptions were low this time they would probably be higher next month due to the fact that they were holding animals over for the adoptathon. Phil also reported that the walk-a-thon was successful this year raising one hundred thousand dollars.

Advisory Board Open Positions

The board discussed the open positions for the Clark County Animal Control Advisory Board. They also heard from Ginger Burr and Cheri Cornelius who were present at the meeting. The candidates introduced themselves and presented their qualifications for the respective positions.

The revised ballots for the appointments were handed out with the addition of Ginger Burr's name added to the livestock position. The board voted on their recommendations for the vacant spots. The votes were tallied and are as follows:

Holly Blosser-Animal Welfare
Ed Anderson-At large
Kevin Neil Klop-Facility Owner/Operator
Ginger Burr-Livestock
Cheri Cornelius-No Domestic Animals

The advisory board asked that these recommendations be submitted to the Clark County Board of Commissioners to make their appointments.

Code Work

Azam Babar came as a guest speaker from the City of Vancouver. The City of Vancouver's planning commission is in the middle of updating and rewriting the code to include doggy day cares to the facility sections. Clark County is on the cutting edge as this is a fairly new concept. Azam summarized V.M.C. 8.24 and the planning commission version of the doggy day care chapter 20.850. He requested feedback from the board that he could pass back to the planning commission. According to the planning commission version in the low and medium density residential zones, doggy day care facilities would be prohibited. They would be allowed in medium and high-density zoning districts and there would be limited uses in commercial zones if conditions were met.

See 20.850 attached

After reviewing the standards the board came up with some recommendations. Under the medium and high density residential districts, the board felt that the minimum one acre per lot was too restrictive and would be too expensive for most doggy day care owners to afford or even find. It was generally felt that these restrictions would make it economically unfeasible for most of the small businesses.

Azam agreed that there were not too many one acre sites available. Under R-22 the ones already in operation such as Happy Puppy Park would be grandfathered in

The board also felt that the suggested limit of twenty dogs per site was too restrictive. They generally thought this should be expanded to thirty dogs at the bare minimum for an indoor only facility and forty if the facility had an outdoor provision. They indicated that since the average going rate is about twenty dollars per dog, the restriction would not be economically feasible for most owners to operate. They did feel that the maximum number of dogs on the site would be reasonable at forty dogs.

They also felt that in the industrial zones the maximum number of dogs should be increased to forty dogs because there are possibly larger warehouses that someone could secure for this purpose.

They also felt that under the general standards the hours of operation should be expanded from the suggested 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM. Linda brought up some concerns regarding the noise standards. They discussed the hours of operation and whether the hours should be adjusted to make sure that it would comply with the W.A.C. noise standard. She advised the board of the allowable noise decible in residential zones and time limits. The board did not feel that the noise generated from picking-up and dropping off dogs at these facilities would be an issue.

The board also discussed the facility license fees. After discussion on the facility inspection processes they agreed that one hundred and fifty dollars (\$150.00) would be a reasonable amount for the doggy day care facility license fee.

Azam reviewed the V.M.C codes pertaining to the kennel facility ordinance 8.24.400 to 8.24.480 Kennel, pet shops, and grooming parlor, requirements. They agreed that all sections pertaining to kennel facilities would be changed to include doggy day care facilities including the definitions section where it would also be added. This would also include 8.24.130 animal noise control where kennels are excluded so would doggy day care facilities.

Azam introduced Paul Lewis, the City Finance Manager who related that under the current contract (5B) relates to facility inspections and gives authority to Clark County Animal Control by the city to inspect. The city conveys animal control to include the fee revenue from dog day care to off set the cost of inspections. Paul indicated that this could be handled administratively in a memorandum of understanding.

IV. Roundtable

Linda stated that Sharon Wyle the county lobbyist will be at the July meeting.

V. Public Forum

There was no public discussion.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 08:25 pm.

VII. Hearing Tribunal

There were three written appeals reviewed this month.

H:Advbd/Minutes/05-04minutes.doc